# Cap 1AC

## 1AC --- Normal:

### Offense:

#### Nuclear power is a manifestation of government control and neoliberal proliferation --- it is the states tool to increase centralized control. UCC:

[“Nuclear Power is No Accident,” Union of Concerned Commies, San Francisco, April 1979. Anti-nuclear power advocacy group. The “…” is in the original text and is not an ellipses // LHP Martin]

Nuclear power is no accident. Its development came out of the cooperation of the state military apparatus and private industry. The slogan "the peaceful atom," as much a part of the '50s as Joe McCarthy, illustrated the convergence of the state's military needs and the profit motive. The scientists who were traumatized by the use of the A-bomb swarmed to the nuclear industry as a means of patching up their battered social consciences. "Cheap" nuclear energy was supposed to propel the American consumer into the blow-dried utopia of ever better toaster ovens and 24-inch TV screens. Also, harnessing nuclear power to generate electricity created the perfect cover for the continued laundering of tax dollars to the swollen corporations that had come to depend on government subsidy during the war. The choice of nuclear power was and is a social decision, and not, as is often claimed, a technical one. In the "free enterprise" or "mixed economy" countries this choice was made by capitalists and their friends in the government. In "company nations" such as the USSR, these people are not even formally separated, and the state directly controls business and the money economy. So it comes as no surprise that their choice of nuclear power also brought them all the usual advantages—increases in centralized control, monopolization of social power, and subordination of science to the ends of capitalist production. Nuclear power helps keep people at safe levels of fear and anxiety, and disasters provide the opportunity to justify the command structure that already functions in the factories, the schools, the prisons, the hospitals. . . The danger of it falling into "the wrong hands" also legitimates the state's official terrorism, its police function augmented for our own good. Our lack of control over our lives becomes the source of its power.

#### And, nuclear power is run by the ruling class --- fuels capitalism by reproducing the productive mindset of the state. SLPS:

[A Socialist Labor Party Statement— Socialism and Nuclear Power (1981) Socialist Labor Party of America, P.O. Box 218, Mountain View, CA 94042-0218 • www.slp.org • socialists@slp.org// LHP JN]

**Socialists can bring** many important **insights to** the questions and concerns raised by **nuclear technology**. However, two aspects of the socialist perspective on the nuclear power issue are primary. One is **the socialist understanding that in a profit-motivated capitalist economy, nuclear power**, like all other technology, **will** inevitably **be developed** and applied **in an unsafe** and environmentally destructive **manner**. The other is the realization **that only in a socialist society** democratically **controlled by workers will it be possible to rationally assess how**—or if—**nuclear power can be safely harnessed.** Certainly, **no solution to the current nuclear danger can be found by taking the problem out of the social context** in which it exists. **The** primary **problem with any technology under capitalism**—even nuclear technology, which admittedly poses special problems—**is not that it is** inherently safe or unsafe, but rather that it is **controlled by a ruling-class minority which manipulates technology to serve its narrow economic interests.** Accordingly, amidst the growing concern over the nuclear dangers posed both by commercial power plants and by the obscene proliferation of nuclear weapons, **the task of Marxists is to** consistently **emphasize the need to free all technology from the fetters of capitalist productive relations.** On the one hand, **Marxists** clearly **favor technological progress** and the general expansion of society's productive forces. Accordingly, Socialists do not see the answer to the problems posed by nuclear technology in a technological retrogression of capitalist society. For one thing, **it is utopian to suggest that society can or will return to a lower level of material development.** Moreover, workers' interests directionally lie in furthering, rather than circumscribing, economic progress. **Socialists** thus seek to **transform society into one based on new social relationships that will allow the worker-majority to become the master of technology, rather than vice versa.** On the other hand, this Marxist tenet does not mean that Socialists blindly support nuclear technology. All technological innovation is not progress, and a socialist society may well decide that the hazards of nuclear technology render it no more useful than red dye #2. Nor should Socialists foster the illusion that the hazards of nuclear power will miraculously disappear with the advent of socialism. Socialist revolution will clearly sound the death knell of the profit-motive and the militarism which have generated the nuclear threat. But socialism is no panacea. Socialists cannot alter the half-life of plutonium nor render living organisms immune to radiation. At the same time, Socialists do not preclude the possibility that nuclear power may be safely harnessed in the future. What can be said is that the future of nuclear power in a socialist society will be a matter of rationally applying scientific know-how rather than a question hinging on the rate of profit. Clearly, the socialist perspective has thus far failed to impress itself on the antinuclear movement. This movement continues to be dominated by antitechnology currents, apolitical opponents of nuclear technology, and capitalist politicians and other liberal reformers. Responsibility for this situation lies, in part, with groups on the left which have failed to bring to the antinuclear movement the Marxist clarity it needs. Typifying this failure are the U.S. Communist Party (CP) and the Socialist Workers Party (SWP). Complicating the CP's views on nuclear power is the fact that its masters in Moscow, like their ruling-class counterparts in Washington, are committed to both nuclear weapons and atomic power plants. The CP has yet to find a satisfactory way of reconciling its opportunistic desire to capitalize on the antinuclear movement and its inability to oppose the reckless nuclear proliferation being directed from the Kremlin. Taking a page out of the CP's book of opportunism, the SWP is taking up the call to shut the nukes down now, all the while seeing little need to establish the capitalist cause of the nuclear danger or to advance a socialist solution. As if black lung were the socialist answer to radiation poisoning, the SWP says the answer to the nuclear hazard is to mine more coal. The SWP asserts, of course, that mining of more coal must be done safely, but a safe mine is as much a pipe dream under capitalism as the accident-proof reactors that supposedly existed on Three Mile Island. That a nuclear danger exists now is clear. **But Socialists cannot** expediently **set aside the realization that the solution to this danger is to free nuclear technology from the limitations and distortions imposed by capitalism. To capitalism falls the task of justifying its technological horrors on the basis of picking the lesser evil. To socialism falls the task of turning technology from the horror it currently is to the benefactor of an emancipated working class.**

#### Nuclear power creates a state of dependency --- propagates state control and neoliberal monitoring. STANDPUNKT:

[no date “Nuclear energy as a weapon in the imperialist competition between states” GegenStandpunkt is the Marxist Quarterly from Germany, date unlisted]

As it is, nuclear energy is about supplying the economy with energy, and this is in fact what energy and electricity generation are all about. Only in this sense is nuclear energy about supplying people with electricity, which is indeed provided to everyone, including the inhabitants of remote countryside hamlets. By providing electricity to the last villager, even those citizens not involved in public life are turned into a resource that is economically accesible, available, and actionable. Without electricity, a modern state would be without radio and television news, internet access, the ability to refrigerate food – essentially, without a people that could be governed. The state thus organizes the supply of electricity to its citizens to keep them functional as a resource for itself as well as for business, which is not quite the same as providing people with the electricity they need to operate night lamps and make cold drinks. Indeed, the fact that the production of energy is not at all about the daily electricity consumption of individual citizens is evident in the impenitent disregard for the safety of human life evinced by the nuclear industry, as well as in the organization of (nuclear) power production and distribution as a profitable business: Everyone has to pay for electricity, and those who cannot afford to do so have their supply cut and will be left to sit in the dark. In this way, the citizen is turned into a paying consumer, and supplying the population with electricity is made useful for economic growth. In other words, an industrial nuclear supply of energy is about providing sufficient energy to power a capitalist economy (rather than about sending a little electricity to grandma’s kitchen). But why does this form of economic organization require the consumption of an ever-increasing amount of energy? The reason for this is quite simply that the goal of the capitalist economy is growth, and its measure of success is the rate of growth. Growth here does not refer to the production of an increasing quantity of material wealth, i.e., useful goods. Rather, growth refers to an increase in invested capital, whose purpose it is to provide the investor with a profit, and in this way to make more of itself – thus the growth for which the state organizes its energy industry is the growth of wealth in the form of money. Since the goal of a capitalist economy is the endless growth of capital, the energy needed to fuel this growth is equally without limit. (This is not all contradicted by recent attempts to “decouple” economic growth and energy consumption. The strategy of lowering the energy cost of growth is itself aimed at increasing profitability and economic growth, even if the increase in energy demand is slowed a little.) Accordingly, those living in a capitalist state are forced to accept and to pay for the energy industry in order to satisfy the requirement of economic growth – even if this entails environmental pollution and radioactive contamination.

#### Now, I defend the resolution as a general principle. If they wish, I’m willing to specify any country or set of countries that currently has nuclear power. I can also specify either immediate decommissioning or a 10-year phase-out.

#### The affirmative is a step in the right direction --- nuclear power is the proper battleground for confronting cap. Impacts spill over and allow for future change. UCC 2:

[“Nuclear Power is No Accident,” Union of Concerned Commies, San Francisco, April 1979. Anti-nuclear power advocacy group. // LHP Martin]

“We All Live in Pennsylvania!” That's what more than 50,000 demonstrators shouted in Hanover, West Germany last week, protesting the construction of a plant to process and store nuclear waste. In Chooz, France, where the government is planning to enlarge an atomic power station, the town's women locked up the mayor for hours in city hall as a protest. And in Denmark, which doesn't have a single nuke, people demanded that Sweden close two nuclear plants that are less than 20 miles from Danish shores. Resistance to nuclear power can lead to a showdown with all aspects of capitalist domination. Nuclear power is an eye-opener, an immediate "analyzer" of the social organization as such. It allows us to see that the social order is the same all over the world. And all over the world the "powers that be" attempt to blackmail us into accepting nuclear energy with the threat of economic collapse (as if the economy wasn't collapsing already). Within the terms of capitalist society this may well be the only scenario. But if we are to choose life and reject austerity, a new vision of society is necessary.

#### And, a radical change in the politics of energy is necessary --- this state dependency on nuclear power results in the exploitation of the poor. SATO:

[Yoshiyuki SATO. “What kind of Philosophy is possible after Fukushima?” Digital Objects and Milieux, Tsukuba University, http://www.journaldumauss.net/spip.php?article1038 // LHP AA]

The desubjectification against the politics of nuclear energy ¶ To conclude, we are going to discuss the problem of the subjectification[assujettissement ] of subjects in the politics of nuclear energy. **This politics was developed by building on the economic disparity between cities** and provinces. **The** **nuclear power plants produce energy for important** **cities**, **but due to the danger** that **they present, they shouldn’t be built in cities**. **They** **are** therefore **exclusively built in provinces** **that** **suffer from** problem of ¶ depopulation and **poverty**. For compensating the land for the nuclear power plant, **the state pays** a enormous amount of **subvention to the communes that have** **accepted it.** Through this State politics, **economy of these communes become** totally **dependent of subventions**, **because this benefice is so big** for the communes. Moreover, the cadastral revenue of the nuclear power plants decreases due to depreciation, **the communes are obliged to accept the construction of** **new** **reactors** for assuring the case flow. **This** vicious **circle** **is** often compared to the one of drugs. It is precisely **desubjecfication of the poor provinces by the State**. One could also call this desubjectification of the provinces “internal colonisation”, which builds on the economic disparity between cities and provinces. ¶ Hiroshi Kainuma, Japanese sociologist, defines this structure as “automatic and voluntary desubjectification of the provinces by the State” and remarks that it doesn’t change at all even after the accident of Fukushima [19]. Indeed, the economy of the communes doted of nuclear power plants depend totally on the latter, and the renouncement of this dependence would lead to the annihilation of its own existence. Like Judith Butler says [20], the subject is produced by the subjectification of power[21]; it is attached to the subjectictification for its auto­ conservation, because the abandon of subjectification equivalents to abandon of its existence. The subject is therefore obliged to desire subjectifcation for auto­conservation. ¶ However, after the accident of Fukushima, this desire seems more than ever revealing this dilemma: “**I understood that the nuclear power plant is dangerous, but if I abandon subjectification, I would abandon my existence**”. For certain “events”, the desire of subjectification could be transformed in the desire of desubjectification, that is to say, ability to act with an aim of resistance to power. And the accident of Fukushima correspond to this “event”. Indeed, in the “vision of reconstruction” published in August 2011, the department of Fukushima proclaims the shut down of nuclear. The village of Tokai, first commune that accepted the construction of nuclear power plant, announces now the shut down of nuclear. At the national level, those who are for the shut down of nuclear count 70 % of the population (though they differ each other in terms of the period of complete shutdown of nuclear) [22]. ¶ To realize the disubjectification against the politic of nuclear energy, **it is indispensable to change the socio­ economic structure that oblige the provinces to “desire” being exploited by the centre**. It will therefore be necessary that the provinces introduce with will a natural energy, using the system of payment for renewable energy (FIT: feed­in tariff) introduced to Japan in 2012, aiming to transform the centralized system of electricity production into decentralized system. ¶ We should seriously assume the eventfulness[événementialité ] of the event of Fukushima that has influenced also seriously our existence as well as our environment. **The technology of nuclear energy has been developed in order to produce nuclear weapon. The everyday use of this technology in the civil society causes inevitably contradictions in related to our condition of life** and even to democracy. From this point of view, **we should** shutdown nuclear [power](including nuclear weapons) **and radically change the actual politics of energy** in view of a politics based on natural energy.

### Framework:

#### The role of the ballot and judge is to reject capitalism and reclaim higher education. I will specify any ROB concerns in CX --- speccing in the AC is pointless as it skews strategy for both debaters since it pinholes offense evaluation. Prefer:

#### 1] Our greatest ethical obligation is to resist capitalism – it’s relevant under any moral theory. MORGARIDGE:

Morgaridge, Clayton, Prof of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College, 1998, Why Capitalism is Evil 08/22 http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html

Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior. The 20th century proves otherwise. What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other. So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response? This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism. But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care. Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism. Nevertheless, I want to claim, the **putting the world at the disposal of** those with **capital has done more damage to** the **ethical life than anything else**. To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism**, Marx writes, **everything** in nature and everything that human beings are and can do **becomes an object: a resource for, or** an **obstacle, to** the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of **markets**, **and** the circulation of **money**. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. **Mountain streams, clean air, human lives** -- **all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only** if they can be used **to turn a profit**.[1] If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. **Capital profits from** the **production of** food, shelter, and all the **necessities** of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. **Therefore ethics**, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, **is left out of deliberations about what** the heavyweight **institutions of** our **society are going to do**. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. **Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.**

#### All moral theories must seek to resolve power disparities because they undermine the equal participation of all relevant parties in the public domain. This makes it impossible to contest any system since it’s not open to questioning so we can never validate the ethical theory. There is no morally relevant distinction between individuals at a fundamental level that could justify disparate treatment for them, so this is a side constraint.

#### 2] Capitalism has messed up education – knowledge is commodified and instrumentalized so it can be distributed according to race and class while thoughts turn to propaganda. McLaren 1’

McLaren, Peter, and Ramin Farahmandpur. "Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy." Journal of Teacher Education 52.2 (2001): 136-150.

THE PRIVATIZATION AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION Examining education policies within the context of economic globalization and neoliberalism raises a number of critical questions that include the following: What are some of the effects of globalization on public schools and public education? To what extent is the content of teaching and curriculum under the perilous influence of the shifting social, economic, and political relations within global capitalism? Spring (1998) identifies a key paradox that frames education and economic policies pursued in the United States and other advanced capital societies. First, education under globalization is viewed as a vehicle that assists the growing market economy. For many developing countries, an educated and skilled workforce ostensibly would mean higher levels of productivity and economic development. Second, education is viewed as a tool in solving problems associated with economic globalization such as unemployment and poverty. If, however, the market economy (by means of the capitalist law of value) is itself the cause of social and economic inequality, then it would appear a contradiction in terms to argue that the goal of education should be to assist in the expansion of the market economy (Spring, 1998). Economic globalization has not only failed to provide political stability and social and economic equality for many nations around the world, but it has also led to deepening social and economic polarization. Willie Thompson (1997) notes, Marx’s insights into the nature of capital’s reproduction and accumulation have never been bettered or displaced: his prevision of its future was extraordinarily percipient and impressively fulfilled. He was never a better prophet than when he insisted that capitalism was hastening towards its unavoidable destruction, that its internal forces carried it in a certain identifiable direction, which (contra Keynes) cannot be reversed or evaded. What capital produces above all is its own gravediggers. Marx meant the working class, and he was mistaken. What looks more likely to be capitalism’s executioner is capitalism itself—the problem is that everything else is practically certain to be entombed with it. (p. 224) As the logic of capital accumulation is shifting toward knowledge-based economies and as newforms of computer technology and biotechnology are being integrated into today’s hightech economy, information itself is fast becoming a high-priced new commodity. Transnational corporations are laboring vigorously to privatize the socially produced knowledge associated with the educational system. Decreased government funding of public education has forced an unholy partnership with private corporations who are seeking to create “high-tech knowledge industries” (Witheford, 1997). Transnational corporations are sponsoring research centers in universities across the United States by donating millions of dollars for the research, development, and production of for-profit technologies. This has resulted in the “high-tech colonization of education,” transforming public universities into corporate-operated “techopolises” that have little interest in coexistence with the poor (Witheford, 1997). Under the command of the market economy, not even universities, colleges, and vocational schools are immune from the economic policies favoring capital accumulation. Niemark (1999) reports that the increasing social policies that support for-profit universities have made higher education an extension of the market economy. She writes that social policies that support privatization have moved in the direction of establishing for-profit degree-granting institutions (such as the University of Phoenix); outsourcing curriculum, instruction, counseling, operations, and administration (in such areas as bookstores, food services, libraries, computer operations, plant maintenance, security, printing, and payroll); signing campus-corporate research and development partnership and licensing agreements; and selling exclusive on-campus marketing rights to companies that sell products as varied as soft drinks, fast food, computers, and credit and telephone calling cards. The campus is becoming virtually indistinguishable from the marketplace, and both universities and their faculties are becoming entrepreneurs. (p. 24) The restructuring of higher education can clearly be seen as reinforcing class inequality and exposing public higher education to social and economic policies governed by the laws of the market economy (i.e., commodification, proletarianization, and capital accumulation). It also visibly functions as an impediment to the education and active participation of citizens in a democratic decision-making process dedicated to coexistence (Niemark, 1999). The shift toward the privatization and corporatization of public education is best exemplified by the corporate raider Michael Milken, the Wall Street wizard and junk bond king of the mid-1980s who deceptively swindled millions of dollars by luring investors into highrisk investment schemes. Milken has returned to the business world, this time by focusing on the lucrative $800 billion education market and has decided to create for-profit education enterprises with the help of his powerful—yet comparatively obscure—$500 million company known as Knowledge Universe. Milken has invested heavily in several companies producing educational materials. Knowledge Universe owns companies such as Children’s Discovery Centers, Bookman Testing Services, Pyramid Imaging Inc., Nobel Education Dynamics, and Leapfrog, which produces educational tools used at learning centers of the Riordan Foundation (Vrana, 1998). In a recent interview with the Los Angeles Times, Milken calculated that if the net worth of the United States is placed at $120 trillion, roughly $75 trillion consists of human capital. This means that every American is worth $400,000 to $500,000 (Vrana, 1998). In short, Milken has discovered that the knowledge business is a profitable commodity. Recent attempts by corporations to influence policy and curriculum decisions in urban schools abound. According to Kalle Lasn (1999), Corporate advertising (or is it the commercial media?) is the largest psychological project ever undertaken by the human race. Yet for all of that, its impact on us remains unknown and largely ignored. When I think of the media’s influence over years, over decades, I think of those brainwashing experiments conducted by Dr. Ewen Cameron in a Montreal psy-chiatric hospital in the 1950s. The idea of the CIA sponsored “depatterning” experiment was to outfit conscious, unconscious or semiconscious subjects with headphones, and flood their brain with thousands of repetitive “driving” messages that would alter their behavior over time. Sound familiar? Advertising aims to do the same thing. Dr. Cameron’s guinea pigs emerged from the Montreal trials with serious psychological damage. It was a great scandal. But no one is saying boo about the ongoing experiment of mass media advertising. In fact, new guinea pigs voluntarily come on board every day. (p. 19) It is not unusual these days to see school buses in certain states covered with advertisements for Burger King and Wendy’s fast food chain restaurants. It has become fashionable for elementary school children to carry books wrapped in free book covers plastered with ads for Kellogg’s Pop Tarts and Fox TV personalities. School districts have gleefully granted Coca-Cola and Pepsi exclusive contracts to sell their products in schools. In health education classes, students are taught nutrition by the Hershey Corporation in a scheme that includes a discussion of the important place of chocolate in a balanced diet. A classroom business course teaches students to value work by exploring how McDonald’s restaurants are operated and what skills are needed to become a successful McDonald’s manager and provides instructions on how to apply for a job at McDonald’s. Ecological and environmental education now involves students learning ecology from a Life of an Ant poster sponsored by Skittles candy and an environmental curriculum video produced by Shell Oil that concentrates on the virtues of the external combustion engine. Finally, a new company called Zap Me! lures schools into accepting thousands of dollars worth of computer equipment, including a satellite dish, 15 top-level personal computers, a furnished computer lab and high-speed Internet access in return for a constant display of on-screen advertisements in the lower left-hand corner of the screen (see Fischman & McLaren, 2000). Lasn (1999) writes, Your kids watch Pepsi and Snickers ads in the classroom (The school has made the devil’s bargain of accepting free audiovisual equipment in exchange for airing these ads on “Channel One”). . . . Administrators in a Texas school district announce plans to boost revenues by selling ad space on the roofs of the district’s seventeen schools—arresting the attention of the fifty-eight million commercial jet passengers whofly into Dallas each year. Kids tattoo their calves with swooshes. Other kids, at raves, begin wearing actual bar codes that other kids can scan, revealing messages such as “I’d like to sleep with you.” . . . A few years ago, marketers began installing ad boards in men’s washrooms on college campuses, at eye level above the urinals. From their perspective, it was a brilliant coup: Where else is a guy going to look? But when I first heard this was being done, I was incensed. One of the last private acts was being co-opted. (pp. 19-21) A math book published by McGraw-Hill is spiked with references to Nike, Gatorade, Disney, McDonald’s, Nabisco, Mattel Barbie dolls, Sony play stations, Cocoa Frosted Flakes, Spalding basketballs and Topps baseball cards (Collins & Yeskel, 2000, p. 78). John Borowski, a public school teacher, recently noted in The New York Times, At least 234 corporations are now flooding the public schools with films, textbooks and computer software under the guise of “instructional material.” A lesson in self-esteem sponsored by Revlon includes an investigation of “good and bad hair days.” In a history lesson, Tootsie Rolls are touted as a part of soldiers’ diets during WorldWar II. Exxon provides a video on the Valdez spill playing down its ecological impact. And Chevron, in a lesson for use in civics science classes, reminds students that they will soon be able to vote and make “important decisions” about global warming, which the company then rebuts as incomplete science. (The New York Times, 1999, p. A23) Another example of corporatism in schools is Channel One, a commercially produced news station that now operates in many American schools. As part of a contractual agreement, teachers agree to broadcast Channel One programs in class for 10 minutes a day in return for a satellite dish, video cassette recorders, and as many television sets as they want. A study of its effects revealed that the students were no better informed than their contemporaries but that the advertisements broadcast on the channel had a significant effect on their consumer tastes (Aitkenhead, cited in Cole, 1998, p. 327). On one hand, schools do contribute to the ideals of democratic organizations (in terms of providing access to relevant knowledge and equal opportunities). On the other hand, schools operate at the same time in sustaining and reinforcing the logic of capitalism by functioning as a reproductive force that offers different and unequal kinds of knowledge and rewards based on class, gender, and race (McLaren, 1997). Here we see inequality as having to do with how society regulates the distribution of different types of capital. Perrucci and Wysong (1999) describe these as consumption capital (having to do with wages or salary), investment capital (having to do with a surplus of consumption capital that you can invest and on which you can earn interest), skills capital (having to do with specialized knowledge that people accumulate through their work experience, training, or education), and social capital (having to do with the network of social ties that people have to family, friends, and acquaintances, as well as the collectively owned economic and cultural capital of a group). Educators have long made the case that schools traffic in cultural capital (values, attitudes, dress, mannerisms, personal style, etc.) (McLaren, 1997), but they have rarely linked the production of cultural capital to the international division of labor brought about by uneven development.

#### Also it’s a contradiction to deny these arguments in the debate space. Pedagogy is never neutral – every position is actively promoting some way of understanding. This means tt is our ultimate ethical responsibility to resist capitalism since it has fetishized our ethical existence, and has undermined the meaning to ethics.

#### And, solely critique is counterproductive – we must integrate policy making in our movements. GIROUX 13:

Henry. "Critique Is Not Enough: Teaching and Learning with Henry Giroux." September 2015

Also, young people are recognizing that they’re not going to find their voice in the Democratic Party or in the existing labor unions. What they really need to fight for are new mass and collective organizations that can call the entirety of society into question and mobilize so as to develop the policies and institutions that make a new and radically democratic society possible. SK: Here’s a paradox for you: How do you teach social change or resistance to authority within public schools – institutions that many have criticized for being authoritarian and resistant to change? HG: You can’t do it if you believe these institutions are so authoritarian that there’s simply no room for resistance. That’s a mistake. Power is never so overwhelming that there’s no room for resistance. Power and the forms it takes are always contradictory in different ways and there is always some room for resistance. What needs to be understood is the intensity of dominant power in different contexts and how it can be named, understood, and fought. The issue here is to seize upon the contradictions at work in these institutions and to develop them in ways that make a difference. During the sixties, the term for this was the long march through institutions and the reference had little to do with reform but with massive restructuring of the instruments of democracy. And we also need to impose a certain kind of responsibility upon adults in the schools – whether they be social workers, university professors, or high school teachers. Clearly it’s not enough to say they operate under terrible burdens that make them voiceless. I understand those structural conditions but it doesn’t mean they shouldn’t resist either. That means they not only have to promote particular kinds of pedagogies in their classrooms but they also have to join social movements that give them the force of a collective voice that can bear down on these problems and create change. The greatest battle that we’re facing in the U.S. today is around the question of consciousness. If people don’t have an understanding of the nature of the problems they face they’re going to succumb to the right-wing educational populist machine. This is a challenge that the Left has never taken seriously because it really doesn’t understand that at the center of politics is the question of pedagogy. Pedagogy is not marginal, it is not something that can be reduced to a method, limited to what happens in high schools, or to what college professors say in their classes. Pedagogy is fundamental not only to the struggle over culture but also, if not more importantly, the struggle over meaning and identity. It’s a struggle for consciousness, a struggle over the gist of agency, if not the future itself – a struggle to convince people that society is more than what it is, that the future doesn’t simply have to mimic the present. SK: What would this look like in practice? One encouraging experiment I had the privilege of observing up close is taking place at the Emiliano Zapata Street Academy in Oakland. There, in an “alternative high school” within the Oakland Unified School District, student interns working with a group called BAY-Peace lead youth in interactive workshops on topics relevant to their lives: street violence, the school-to-prison pipeline, military recruiters in their schools, and so on. HG: I think two things have to go on here, and you just mentioned one of them. We’ve got to talk about alternative institutions. There has to be some way to build institutions that provide a different model of education. On the Left, we had this in the ‘20s and ‘30s: socialists had Sunday schools, they had camps; they found alternative ways to educate a generation of young people to give them a different understanding of history, of struggle. We need to reclaim that legacy, update it for the twenty-first century, and join the fight over the creation of new modes of thinking, acting, and engaging ourselves and our relations to others. On the second level is what Rudi Dutschke called what I referred to earlier as the “long march through the institutions.” It’s a model that makes a tactical claim to having one foot in and one foot out. You can’t turn these established institutions over to the Right. You can’t simply dismiss them by saying they’re nothing more than hegemonic institutions that oppress people. That’s a retreat from politics. You have to fight within these institutions. Not only that, you have to create new public spheres. SK: Henry, we’ve covered a lot of territory. Is there anything we haven’t addressed that you would like to bring up before closing? HG: We need both a language of critique and a language of hope. **Critique is essential** to what we do but it can never become so overwhelming that all **we become** are critics and **nothing else. It is counterproductive** for the left **to engage in declar[e]ations of powerlessness, without creating as Jacques Rancière argues “new** objects, forms, and **spaces that thwart** official **expectations.**” What we need to do is theorize, understand and **fight for a soci**ety that is very different from the one in which we now live. That means taking seriously the question of pedagogy as central to any notion of viable progressive politics; it means working collectively with others to build social movements that address a broader language of our society – questions of inequality and power (basically the two most important issues we can talk about now.) And I think that we need to find ways to support young people because the most damage that’s going to be done is going to be heaped upon the next generations. So what we’re really fighting for is not just democracy; we’re fighting for the future. And so critique is not enough; we need a language of critique and we need a language of possibility to be able to go forward with this.

# Frontlines/Add ins:

## Kritik:

### Borders K:

#### 1] Cross apply Giroux --- we cannot just abstractly critique, rather we need to integrate out change will social mindset – there is no dismissing the hegominic institutions, we should just work within them. This means the kritik doesn’t solve.

#### 2] Alternative is impossible --- individuals will always construct some divisions between them. For example, we separate our house from that of our neighbors --- the vague distinction for what a border is means there is no way we can completely eliminate them. NEWMAN 06:

[Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University, Beer Sheba, Israel (David, Progress in Human Geography, April, “The lines that continue to separate us: borders in our 'borderless' world,” vol. 30, no. 2, p. 143)

**We live in a world of lines and compartments.** We may not necessarily see the lines, but they order our daily life practices, strength-ening our belonging to, and identity with, places and groups, while- at one and the same time - perpetuating and reperpet-uating notions of difference and othering. For some, the notion of a 'borderless' and 'deterritorialized' world has become a buzz word for globalization (Kuper, 2004; Caney, 2005), but **it is not possible** **to imagine a world which is borderless or deterritorialized. Even the globalization purists would accept that the basic ordering of society requires cate-gories and compartments, and that borders create order** (Albert et at, 2001; van Houtum and van Naerssen, 2002).

#### 3] Case outweighs --- neoliberal mindsets have infected our institutions, that’s mclaren, this means that any education we get from the Kritik is skewed because we are all mindless consumers --- only the case solves.

#### 4] Perm --- do the aff then the alt, solves because we can solve neolib then deconstruct borders --- no urgency to the alt.

5] Perm do both --- borders theory should not be considered in a vacuum without regard for specific policies. JOHANSON **04:**

(Marta C., “SELF DETERMINATION AND BORDERS: The Obligation to Show Consideration for the Interests of Others,” pg. 172-173)

Choices between principles have been argued above to constitute a problematic response to colliding principles, and the remaining legal options therefore available are harmonisation, reconciliation or 'weighing' of principles against one another in specific contexts. How then is reconciliation, balancing or weighing to be effected? The primary way in which harmonisation or reconciliation possibly could be achieved is by interpretation. It is debatable, however, whether balancing, weighing or harmonising really falls within the scope of interpretation. If interpretation is limited to a dogmatic activity seeking only to clarify the meaning of norms, then application of the rules or principles in a situation where they come into conflict cannot fall within the definition. Balancing goes beyond this, as additional decisions and valuations are required when the issue is not of the priority of a rule over another rule. **For interpretation to be useful as a tool in norm conflicts where, for example, the necessity of limiting the extent of principles seems a distinct possibility, it would have to determine the meaning of the norms in the context in which they are to be applied. It is clearly impossible to conduct such an interpretation without regard to the situation at hand. The logical conclusion is that interpretation** of the UN Charter Purposes, a**t least in relation to issues of territory and boundaries, cannot be conducted in a vacuum.**

### Union Cap K:

1]

### Developing Countries K:

1] Does not tangibly increase actual cap

## Disad:

### Coal:

#### Evaluate the impacts of the DA through the lense of the aff framework --- if the 1NC did not articulate a reason why the aff perpetuates cap because of the DA then it is not offense.

#### 1] Uniqueness overwhelms the link --- coal’s dead and there’s no coming back ALPHA 12:

Seeking Alpha, 7-13-2012, “Coal Is Dead; Long Live Natural Gas,” http://seekingalpha.com/article/719541-coal-is-dead-long-live-natural-gas

When reality turned out to be different from expectations, **coal price collapsed with natural gas flooding the electricity generating market. Since natural gas is more efficient, cleaner, and now inexpensive,** the **coal** industry as a **whole faces** major trouble**. Power generation from natural gas has matched coal for the first time. This major trend appears unstoppable.** And **the worst may be yet to come. All coal miners will have to downsize, and more will go bust.** Within the United States, coal **consumption has dropped sharply** during recent years as natural gas gradually becomes cheap and abundant, replacing thermal coal in power plants. The following chart shows this trend vividly. Click to enlarge In the meantime, U.S. coal stocks have been rising as supply constantly outruns demand, which almost inevitably leads to lower prices. **Given coal miners' razor-thin profit margin in general, a small coal price movement often translates into huge stock price swings.** And finally, as coal production piles up, the export of coal has been rising sharply (in the following chart). The sharp rise in exports is a consequence of price collapse—it becomes so cheap that it's a better deal for other continents to ship coal across the ocean, still cheaper than digging in their own backyards. Coal mining is a dirty business, polluting self while serving cheap coal to other countries perhaps wouldn't serve the industry well politically**. Given such overwhelming trends, one has to be very suspicious of the sustainability of this industry for years to come.** One possible policy change that might help coal mining is that the environmentalists and the EPA manage to stop hydraulic fracturing of natural gas, which will curb natural gas supply and make dirtier coal a viable option again—a bit ironic, isn't it? The one that might do better than the others is Walter Energy, Inc. (WLT), which has a focus on metallurgical coal for the steel industry, and is not so much dependent on thermal coal (for burning). So what about natural gas? Would major natural gas businesses such as Chesapeake Energy Corporation (CHK) become the new king? Not necessarily. With abundant reserve and a relatively cheap way of exploration, competition will be fierce. Big players like Exxon Mobile still have an edge in financial resources. At the end of the day, companies like Chesapeake are not necessarily winners even if natural gas becomes mainstream. Overall, **investors** shall not counton a turnaround **of the coal industry like what happened during the last roller coaster cycle of coal prices.**

#### 2] Empirics --- natural gas market has killed coal. No way to trigger the impact SILVERSTEIN:

Ken Silverstein, Energy Central Editor for Forbes, 5-23-2012, “Natural Gas Smothering 'Clean Coal' and Carbon Capture,” Forbes, www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2012/05/23/natural-gas-smothering-clean-coal-and-carbon-capture/

The energy business is supposed to move at a snail’s pace. And while no one had heard of shale gas 10 years ago, it is now the hot topic. At the same time, **the price of** such unconventional **natural gas has declined precipitously, making it a**n economic **bargain compared to coal.** Meantime, **the coal s**ector **has been given a number of one-two punches by** environmental **regulators** with the most recent coming in March that nullified any future plants that can’t sequester carbon. “Regulation is certainly a key,” says Nick Akins, chief executive of American Electric Power, during an EnergyBiz appearance. “It must be consistent and coherent. But decisions are being made and the regulations could change overnight.” As for AEP, it has chosen to hold off on building a pilot plant that would use carbon capture and sequestration technology. It estimated the cost to be $664 million, roughly half of which was to be paid by the U.S. Department of Energy. It cited the prevailing political landscape, noting that it would be unable to recover its expenses from ratepayers. “We can’t forget about the customers who are paying the bills and who would authorize this recovery,” says Akins. “There was not any enabling legislation requiring this to be done. We are already dealing with environmental costs and it is very difficult for state utility commissions and customers to pay the additional costs over and above basic infrastructure needs.” In 2009, the Energy Department awarded AEP $334 million through the Clean Coal Power Initiative to help pay for installation of a commercial-scale carbon capture and sequestration system at AEP’s Mountaineer coal-fueled power plant in New Haven, WV. The system was designed to capture at least 90 percent of the carbon dioxide from 235 megawatts of the plant’s 1,300 megawatts of capacity. The captured carbon, approximately 1.5 million metric tons per year, would have been treated and compressed, then injected into suitable geologic formations for permanent storage approximately 1.5 miles below the surface**. AEP is not the only one having “clean coal” troubles. S**o is Tenaska Energy, which had been pushing hard for a coal gasification facility that scrubs coal of most of its impurities before turning it into a gas and creating electricity. Exelon Corp., however, is opposed, emphasizing that it would be cheaper and easier to just burn the natural gas, noting that Illinois taxpayers would have to pay $3.5 billion for this deal. Tenaska, on the other hand, has been trying to get the state legislature there to view the project as a 40-year endeavor. It is adding that Exelon has a vested interest in stopping the construction: Capacity from the coal gasification unit would be bid into the system, making Exelon’s energy offerings less valuable. Now, though, Tenaska may relent and build a traditional natural gas plant. But it is saying that the same facility could be later modified to gasify coal. “It makes absolutely no sense to take coal and make synthetic natural gas out of it,” says Paul Grimmer, chief executive of Eltron Research in Boulder, Colo., in a talk with this reporter. “The processes are too expensive. But if you see a huge run-up in natural gas, it may then make sense.” Duke Energy, however, will be firing up a 618 megawatt coal gasification plant in Indiana this fall. It’s a $3 billion public-private partnership that has gotten a pummeling from its opponents who have said that the price tag just keeps rising. But Duke-Indiana President Doug Esamann told this reporter that the facility will be the state’s most reliable and most cost effective electric generator. It will also have the potential to capture and bury carbon releases. Meanwhile, Southern Company also has a $3 billion coal gasification effort in Mississippi. Then there’s FutureGen. It’s a $1.1 billion project that is expected to be 200 megawatts — one that will retrofit an oil-fueled unit in Meredosia, Illinois. “Gasification has been around for some time,” says John Mead, director of the Coal Extraction and Utilization Research Center at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, in an earlier talk. “But incremental improvements” in current coal generation technologies are becoming increasingly beneficial. The Obama administration wants to not just advance coal gasification but also carbon sequestration. To that end, it is providing funds to get 5 to 10 such projects underway. That’s possible within 15 years, says the Government Accountability Office. But technical obstacles still persist that would increase the cost of electricity to consumers by at least 30 percent and potentially as much as 80 percent. That’s a tough pill to swallow. But President **Obama is trying to throw coal-based utilities a life-saving rope, saying that the government will assist with t**he financing of progressive, **new technologies. Some power companies are getting cold feet,** however, **as natural gas is providing them with an acceptable escape route.**

#### 3] Anti-Nuclear efforts have spurred transition to renewables empirically confirmed. RANKIN:

Rankin 15’- Jennifer, “Germany's planned nuclear switch-off drives energy innovation”, Journalist, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/nov/02/germanys-planned-nuclear-switch-off-drives-energy-innovation-

[Hinkley Point](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/oct/29/hinkley-point-c-nuclear-power-station-cost-customers-4bn) will be the first nuclear power plant to be built in Europe since the meltdown of [Japan’s Fukushima reactor in 2011.](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/mar/22/japan-nuclear-crisis-uk-power-stations) But **while the British government sees nuclear energy as a safe and reliable source of power, Germany is going in a different direction. As a result of the Fukushima, Chancellor Angela Merkel pledged to switch off all nuclear power by 2022 and fill the gap with renewables** – a process known as the[energiewende (energy transition)](https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/nuclear-power-germany-renewable-energy). Germany’s push for renewables grew out of the anti-nuclear protests **of the 1980s and currently more than a quarter (26%) of its electricity comes from wind, solar and other renewable sources, such as biomass,** [**although 44% is from coal**](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jul/07/brown-coal-wins-a-reprieve-in-germanys-transition-to-a-green-future)**. The country’s government wants to increase the share of renewables in electricity to 40% to 45% by 2025.**

### Warming:

#### Evaluate the impacts of the DA through the lense of the aff framework --- if the 1NC did not articulate a reason why the aff perpetuates cap because of the DA then it is not offense.

#### 1] Global cooling coming – 11 years of research. GWPF 9/8:

[Global Warming Policy Forum. “NEW SOLAR RESEARCH RAISES CLIMATE QUESTIONS, TRIGGERS ATTACKS.” September 8, 2016. http://www.thegwpf.com/new-solar-research-raises-climate-questions-triggers-attacks/]

To most of us the sun seems unchanging. But if you observe its surface, it is seething with vast explosions and ejections. This activity has its origin in intense magnetic fields generated by swirling currents in the sun’s outer layer – scientists call it **the solar dynamo**. It **produces the well-known 11-year solar cycle** which can be seen as sunspots come and go on the sun’s surface. **But models of the solar dynamo have only been partially successful** in predicting the solar cycle – and that might be **because a vital component is missing**. After studying full-disc images of the sun’s magnetic field, **Professor** Valentina **Zharkova** of Northumbria University and colleagues, **discovered that the sun’s dynamo is actually made of two components** – coming from different depths inside the sun.**The interaction between these two magnetic waves either amplifies solar activity or damps it down.** Professor **Zharkova’s observations suggest we are due for a prolonged period of low solar activity.** Professor Valentina Zharkova: We will see it from 2020 to 2053, when the three next cycles will be very reduced magnetic field of the sun. Basically what happens is these two waves, they separate into the opposite hemispheres and they will not be interacting with each other, which means that resulting magnetic field will drop dramatically nearly to zero. And this will be a similar conditions like in Maunder Minimum. What will happen to the Earth remains to be seen and predicted because nobody has developed any program or any models of terrestrial response – they are based on this period when the sun has maximum activity — when the sun has these nice fluctuations, and its magnetic field [is] very strong. But we’re approaching to the stage when the magnetic field of the sun is going to be very, very small. She suggests it could be **a repeat of the so-called Maunder Minimum** – a period in the 17th century with little solar activity **that may have influenced a cooling on Earth**. Whatever we do to the planet, if everything is done only by the sun, then the temperature should drop similar like it was in the Maunder Minimum. At least in the Northern hemisphere, where this temperature is well protocoled and written. We didn’t have many measurements in the Southern hemisphere, we don’t know what will happen with that, but in the Northern hemisphere, we know it’s very well protocoled. **The rivers are frozen. There are winters and no summers, and so on**. So we only hope because these Maunder Minima will be shorter, the Maunder Minimum of the 17th century was about 65 years, **the Maunder Minimum which we expect will be lasting** not longer than **30-35 years**. Of course things are not the same as they were in the 17th century – we have a lot more greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. And it will be interesting to see how the terrestrial and the solar influences play out. This is promising research – a new insight into our sun with predictions as to its future behavior, yet Professor Zharkova relates than some climatologists resented her discovery. Professor Valentina Zharkova: Some of them were welcoming and discussing. But some of them were quite — I would say — pushy. They were trying to actually silence us. Some of them contacted the Royal Astronomical Society, demanding, behind our back, that they withdraw our press release. The Royal Astronomical Society replied to them and CCed to us and said, ‘Look, this is the work by the scientists who we support, please discuss this with them.’ We had about 8 or 10 exchanges by email, when I tried to prove my point, and I’m saying, I’m willing to look at what you do, I’m willing to see how our results we produced and what the sun has explained to us. So how this is transformed into climate we do not produce; we can only assume it should be. So we’re happy to work with you, and add to your data our results. So don’t take the sunspots which you get, we can give you our curve. Work with our curve. So they didn’t want to.Professor Zharkova’s work may have significantly improved our ability to forecast solar activity. If we do enter a new Maunder Minimum, then we are bound to discover new things about our sun and its influences on our climate.

#### Current warming key to stop an Ice age. MORALES 16:

Alex Morales, 1-13-2016, "The Good News on Global Warming: We've Delayed the Next Ice Age," Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-01-13/the-good-news-on-global-warming-we-ve-delayed-the-next-ice-age

Global warming caused by fossil fuel emissions is blamed by scientists for intensifying storms, raising sea levels and prolonging droughts. Now there’s growing evidence of a positive effect: we may have delayed the next ice age by 100,000 years or more. QUICKTAKE Climate Change The conditions necessary for the onset of a new ice age were narrowly missed at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the 1800s, researchers at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research near Berlin wrote Wednesday in the journal Nature. Since then, rising emissions of heat-trapping CO2 from burning oil, coal and gas have made the spread of the world’s ice sheets even less likely, they said. “This study further confirms what we’ve suspected for some time, that the carbon dioxide humans have added to the atmosphere will alter the climate of the planet for tens to hundreds of thousands of years, and has canceled the next ice age,” said Andrew Watson, a professor of Earth sciences at the University of Exeter in southwest England who wasn’t involved in the research. "Humans now effectively control the climate of the planet." The study reveals new findings on the relationship between insolation, a measure of the Sun’s energy reaching the planet, levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, and the spread of ice sheets that characterize an ice age. The researchers in Germany were able to use computer models to replicate the last eight glacial cycles and provide predictions on when the next might occur. The scientists found that even without further output of heat-trapping gases, the next ice age probably wouldn’t set in for another 50,000 years. That would make the current so-called inter-glacial period “unusually long,” according to the lead author, Andrey Ganopolski. “However, our study also shows that relatively moderate additional anthropogenic CO2-emissions from burning oil, coal and gas are already sufficient to postpone the next ice age for another 50,000 years,” which would mean the next one probably won’t start for 100,000 years, he said. “The bottom line is that we are basically skipping a whole glacial cycle, which is unprecedented.

#### Extinction. DEMING 09:

David Deming 2009 (geophysicist and associate professor of Arts and Sciences at the University of Oklahoma) The Coming Ice Age, 5/13/09, http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/05/the\_coming\_ice\_age.html

In northern Europe, the Little Ice Age kicked off with the Great Famine of 1315. Crops failed due to cold temperatures and incessant rain. Desperate and starving, parents ate their children, and people dug up corpses from graves for food. In jails, inmates instantly set upon new prisoners and ate them alive. The Great Famine was followed by the Black Death, the greatest disaster ever to hit the human race. One-third of the human race died; terror and anarchy prevailed. Human civilization as we know it is only possible in a warm interglacial climate. Short of a catastrophic asteroid impact, the greatest threat to the human race is the onset of another ice age. The oscillation between ice ages and interglacial periods is the dominant feature of Earth's climate for the last million years. But the computer models that predict significant global warming from carbon dioxide cannot reproduce these temperature changes. This failure to reproduce the most significant aspect of terrestrial climate reveals an incomplete understanding of the climate system, if not a nearly complete ignorance. Global warming predictions by meteorologists are based on speculative, untested, and poorly constrained computer models. But our knowledge of ice ages is based on a wide variety of reliable data, including cores from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets. In this case, it would be perspicacious to listen to the geologists, not the meteorologists. By reducing our production of carbon dioxide, we risk hastening the advent of the next ice age. Even more foolhardy and dangerous is the Obama administration's announcement that they may try to cool the planet through geoengineering. Such a move in the middle of a cooling trend could provoke the irreversible onset of an ice age. It is not hyperbole to state that such a climatic change would mean the end of human civilization as we know it. Earth's climate is controlled by the Sun. In comparison, every other factor is trivial. The coldest part of the Little Ice Age during the latter half of the seventeenth century was marked by the nearly complete absence of sunspots. And the Sun now appears to be entering a new period of quiescence. August of 2008 was the first month since the year 1913 that no sunspots were observed. As I write, the sun remains quiet. We are in a cooling trend. The areal extent of global sea ice is above the twenty-year mean. We have heard much of the dangers of global warming due to carbon dioxide. But the potential danger of any potential anthropogenic warming is trivial compared to the risk of entering a new ice age. Public policy decisions should be based on a realistic appraisal that takes both climate scenarios into consideration.

#### 2] Disad is non-unique --- nuke energy still wrecks the environment and causes warming – regs don’t check. CALDICOTT 06:

[Caldicott, Helen. Nuclear Power is not the answer to Global Warming or anything else. Melbourne Univ. Publishing, 2006// LHP AA]

**Nuclear power is not** “clean and **green**,” as the industry claims, **because large amounts of** traditional **fossil fuels are required to mine** **and refine** the **uranium needed to** run nuclear power **reactors**, **to construct** the massive concrete reactor **buildings, and to transport** and store the **toxic** radioactive **waste** created by the nuclear process. **Burning of this** fossil fuel **emits significant** quantities of carbon dioxide (CO2)—the primary “**greenhouse gas**”—into the atmosphere. In addition, **large amounts of** the now-banned chlorofluorocarbon gas (**CFC**) **are emitted** **during** the **enrichment of uranium**. **CFC gas is** **not** **only** 10,000 to **20,000** times **more efficient** **as a**n atmospheric **heat trapper** (“greenhouse gas”) than CO2, **but it** **is a** classic “pollutant” and a potent **destroyer of the ozone layer**. While currently the creation of nuclear electricity produces only one-third the amount of CO2 emitted from a similar-sized, conventional gas generator, this is a transitory statistic. Over several decades, as the concentration of available uranium ore declines, more fossil fuels will be required to extract the ore from less concentrated ore veins. **Within ten to twenty years**, **nuclear reactors will produce no net energy** **because** **of** **the** massive amounts of **fossil fuel that will be** **necessary to mine** **and** to **enrich** the remaining poor grades of uranium. (The nuclear power industry contends that large quantities of uranium can be obtained by reprocessing radioactive spent fuel. However, this process is extremely expensive, medically dangerous for nuclear workers, and releases large amounts of radioactive material into the air and water; it is therefore not a pragmatic consideration.) By extension, the operation of nuclear power plants will then produce exactly the same amounts of greenhouse gases and air pollution as standard power plants. Contrary to the nuclear industry claims, smoothly running nuclear power plants are also not emission free. Government **regulations allow nuclear plants “routinely”** to **emit** hundreds of thousands of curies of **radioactive gases** and other radioactive elements **into the** **environment** every year. Thousands of **tons** **of** solid radioactive **waste are** presently **accumulating** **in** the cooling pools beside the 103 operating nuclear plants in **the United** **States** and hundreds of others throughout the world. This waste contains extremely toxic elements that will inevitably pollute the environment and human food chains, a legacy that will lead to epidemics of cancer, leukemia, and genetic disease in populations living near nuclear power plants or radioactive waste facilities for many generations to come.

### Space:

#### Evaluate the impacts of the DA through the lense of the aff framework --- if the 1NC did not articulate a reason why the aff perpetuates cap because of the DA then it is not offense.

#### 1] No link --- I say countries ought to prohibit the production, not that we should in space

#### 2] It’s a link --- the aff is a critique of technocracy --- the disad is a perfect instance of that --- its just another excuse for the state to develop technology for the exchange of state control.

#### 3] The impact could literally be in a million years --- they say extinction inevitable on earth but don’t say how long that takes. This means case outweighs on time-frame because impact happens NOW.

#### 4] Nuke power isn’t key --- its actually much worse for space. Solar solves best, that means the squo solves. GROSSMAN:

[Karl Grossman, 11-19-2014, "Recent issues demonstrate risks of nuclear power in space," Enformable, <http://enformable.com/2014/11/recent-issues-demonstrate-risks-nuclear-power-space/> //LHP SG]

**The recent crash of** Virgin Galactic’s **SpaceShip**Two **and explosion on launch** three days earlier of an Antares rocket **further underline the dangers of inserting nuclear material in the always perilous space flight equation**—as the U.S. and Russia still plan. “SpaceShipTwo has experienced an in-flight anomaly,” [Virgin Galactic tweeted](http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/10/31/us-space-crash-virgin-factbox-idUSKBN0IK2GO20141031)after the spacecraft, on which $500 million has been spent for development, exploded on October 31 after being released by its mother ship.   One pilot was killed, another seriously injured. Richard Branson, Virgin Galactic founder, hoped to begin flying passengers on SpaceShipTwo this spring. [Some 800 people](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/reuters/article-2816452/Bransons-Virgin-Galactic-quest-space-tourism.html), including actor Leonard DiCaprio and physicist Steven Hawking,  have signed up for $250,000-a person tickets to take a suborbital ride. SpaceShipTwo debris was spread over the Mojave Desert in California. Three days before, on Wallops Island, Virginia, an Antares rocket operated by Orbital Sciences Corp. blew up seconds after launch. It was carrying 5,000 pounds of supplies and experiments to the International Space Station. The [cost of the rocket](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2810128/Ready-liftoff-Nighttime-rocket-launch-International-Space-Station-visible-East-Coast.html) alone was put at $200 million.   **NASA**, [in a statement](http://www.nasa.gov/content/frequently-asked-questions-on-antares-launch-anomaly/), **said that the rocket “suffered** a catastrophic anomaly.”   The word anomaly, defined as something that deviates from what is standard, normal or expected, has for years been a space program euphemism for a **disastrous accident. “These two recent space ‘anomalies’** remind us that technology frequently goes wrong,” said Bruce Gagnon, coordinator of the [Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space](http://enformable.com/2014/11/recent-issues-demonstrate-risks-nuclear-power-space/www.space4peace.org).   “When you consider **adding nuclear power into the mix it becomes an explosive combination.** We’ve long been sounding the alarm that **nuclear power in space is not something the public nor the planet can afford to take a chance on**.” But “adding nuclear power into the mix” is exactly what the U.S. and Russia are planning. Both countries have been using nuclear power on space missions for decades—and **accidents involving their nuclear-powered space devices have happened with substantial amounts of radioactive particles released on Earth**. Now, a major expansion in space nuclear power activity is planned with the development by both nations of nuclear-powered rockets for trips to Mars. One big U.S. site for this is NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama. “NASA Researchers Studying Advanced Nuclear Rocket Technologies,” announced NASA last year. At the center, it said, “The Nuclear Cryogenic Propulsion team is tackling a three-year project to demonstrate the viability of nuclear propulsion technologies.”  In them, a “nuclear rocket uses a nuclear reactor to heat hydrogen to very high temperatures, which expands through a nozzle to generate thrust. Nuclear rocket engines generate higher thrust and are more than twice as efficient as conventional chemical engines.” “A first-generation nuclear cryogenic propulsion system could propel human explorers to Mars more efficiently than conventional spacecraft, reducing crew’s exposure to harmful space radiation and other effects of long-term space missions,” NASA went on. “It could also transport heavy cargo and science payloads.” And out at Los Alamos National Laboratory, the DUFF project—for Demonstrating Using Flattop Fissions—is moving ahead to develop a “robust fission reactor prototype that could be used as a power system for space travel,” according to Technews World. The laboratory’s Advanced Nuclear Technology Division is running the joint Department of Energy-NASA project. “Nuclear Power Could Blast Humans Into Deep Space,” was the headline of [Technewsworld’s  2012 article](http://www.technewsworld.com/story/76699.html%C2%A0) about it. It quoted Dr. Michael Gruntman, professor of aerospace engineering and systems architecture at the University of Southern California, saying,“If we want solar system exploration, we must utilize nuclear technology.” The article declared: “Without the risk, there will be no reward.” And in Texas, near NASA’s Johnson Space Center, the Ad Astra Rocket Company of former U.S. astronaut Franklin Chang-Diaz is busy working on what it calls the Variable Specific Impulse Magnetoplasma Rocket or VASMIR.  Chang-Diaz began Ad Astra after retiring from NASA in 2005. He’s its president and CEO. The VASMIR system could utilize  solar power, [related Space News last year](http://www.space.com/23613-advanced-space-propulsion-vasimr-engine.html), but “using a VASMIR engine to make a superfast Mars run would require incorporating a nuclear reactor that cranks out megawatts of power, Chang-Diaz said, adding that developing this type of powerful reactor should be high on the nation’s to-do list.”    Chang-Diaz told [Voice of America](http://www.voanews.com/content/former-astronaut-develops-powerful-rocket-123960664/173696.htmlhttp://www.voanews.com/content/former-astronaut-develops-powerful-rocket-123960664/173696.html) that by using a nuclear reactor for power “we could do a mission to Mars that would take about 39 days, one-way.”   NASA Director Charles Bolden, also a former astronaut as well as a Marine Corps major general, has been a booster of Ad Asra’s project. Ad Astra and the Nuclear Cryogenic Propulsion project have said their designs would include nuclear systems only starting up when “out of the atmosphere” to prevent, in the event of an accident, “spreading radiation back to Earth.” However, this isn’t a fail-safe plan. The Soviet Union followed this practice on the satellites powered by nuclear reactors that it launched between the 1960s and 1980s. This included the Cosmos 954. Its on board reactor was only allowed to go critical after it was in orbit, but it subsequently came crashing back to Earth in 1978, breaking up and spreading radioactive debris on the Northwest Territories of Canada. As to Russia now, “A ground-breaking Russian nuclear space travel propulsion system will be ready by 2017 and will power a ship capable of long-haul interplanetary missions by 2025, giving Russia a head start in the outer-space race,” the [Russian news agency RT reported](http://rt.com/news/space-nuclear-engine-propulsion-120/) in 2012.   “Nuclear power has generally been considered a valid alternative to fossil fuels to power space craft, as it is the only energy source capable of producing the enormous thrust needed for interplanetary travel….The revolutionary propulsion system falls in line with recently announced plans for Russia to conquer space…Entitled Space Development Strategies up to 2030, Russia aims to send probes to Mars, Jupiter, and Venus, as well as establish a series of bases on the moon.” This year [OSnet Daily](http://osnetdaily.com/2014/01/russia-advances-development-of-nuclear-powered-spacecraft/), in an article headlined “Russia advances development of nuclear powered Spacecraft,” reported that in 2013 work on the Russian nuclear rocket moved “to the design stage.” As for space probes, many U.S. and Russian probes have until recently gotten their on board electrical power from systems fueled with plutonium— hotly radioactive from the start. Also, the U.S. has begun to power Mars rovers with plutonium. After using solar power on Mars rovers, in 2012 NASA launched a Mars rover it named Curiosity fueled with 10.6 pounds of plutonium. NASA plans to launch a Mars rover nearly identical to Curiosity, which it is calling Mars 2020, in 2020. As devastating in terms of financial damage were last week’s explosions of the Virgin Galactic SpaceshipTwo and Antares rocket, **an accident involving a nuclear-powered vehicle or device could be far more costly** The [NASA Final Environmental Impact Statement](http://science.nasa.gov/media/medialibrary/2010/11/05/MSL-FEIS_Vol1.pdf) for the Curiosity (then called Mars Science Laboratory) mission states, for example, that the **cost of decontamination of areas affected by dispersed plutonium would be $267 million for each square mile of farmland, $478 million for each square mile of forests and $1.5 billion for each square mile of “mixed-use urban areas.”** Odds of an accident were acknowledged as being low. The EIS said a launch accident discharging plutonium had a 1-in-420 chance of happening and could “release material into the regional area defined…within…62 miles of the launch pad” on Cape Canaveral, Florida. **The EIS said that** “overall” on the mission, the likelihood of plutonium being released was 1-in-220.  I**f there were an accident resulting in plutonium fallout that occurred before the rocket carrying Curiosity broke through Earth’s gravitational field, people could be affected in a broad swath of Earth “anywhere between 28-degrees north and 28-degrees south latitude” on Earth, said the EIS. Gagnon said at the time: “NASA sadly appears committed** to maintaining its dangerous alliance with the nuclear industry…The taxpayers are being asked once again to pay for **nuclear missions that could endanger the lives of all the people on the planet**. Have we not learned anything from Chernobyl and Fukushima? We don’t need to be launching nukes into space. It’s not a gamble we can afford to take.” Curiosity made it up, and to Mars. **But in NASA’s history of nuclear power shots, happening since the 1950s, there have been accidents.** The worst among the 26 U.S. space nuclear missions listed in the Curiosity EIS occurred in 1964 and involved the SNAP-9A plutonium system aboard a **satellite that failed to achieve orbit and dropped to Earth, disintegrating as it fell. Its plutonium fuel dispersed widely That accident spurred NASA to develop solar energy for satellites and now all satellites are solar-powered as is the International Space Station.** And in recent times, **solar power has been increasingly shown to be practical** even to generate on board electricity for missions far out in space. On its way to Jupiter now is NASA’s Juno **space probe**, chemically-propelled and with solar photovoltaic panels generating all its on board electricity. When Juno **reaches Jupiter in 2016 it will be nearly 500 million miles from the Sun, but the**[**high-efficiency solar cells**](http://www.cnet.com/news/juno-spacecraft-poised-for-five-year-voyage-to-jupiter/)**will still be generating power. In August, the European Space Agency’s Rosetta space probe, similarly solar-powered, rendezvoused with a comet in deep space, 400 million miles from Earth. Advances**, too, **have been made in propelling spacecraft in the vacuum of space. The Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency in 2010 launched what it termed a “space yacht”**[**it called Ikaros**](http://www.space.com/25800-ikaros-solar-sail.html%20%C2%A0)**which successfully got its propulsion power from the pressure on its large sails of ionizing particles emitted by the Sun.** Among other ways of propelling spacecraft, discussed at a Starship Congress last year in Texas was a system using orbiting lasers to direct beams on to a spacecraft. The [magazine New Scientist said](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0262407913620655) “beam sails are regarded as the most promising tech for a starship.” A scientist long-involved in laser space power research is Geoff Landis of the Photovoltaics and Space Environment Branch at NASA’s Glenn Research Center in Cleveland who, in a 2002 NASA publication,[“The Edge of Sunshine,”](http://science.nasa.gov/science-news/science-at-nasa/2002/08jan_sunshine/) wrote: “In the long term, solar arrays will not have to rely on the Sun. We’re investigating the concept of using lasers to beam photons to solar arrays. If you make a powerful enough laser and can aim the beam, there’s really isn’t any edge to sunshine—with a big enough lens, we could beam light to a space-probe halfway to alpha-Centauri!”

### Desalination:

#### Evaluate the impacts of the DA through the lense of the aff framework --- if the 1NC did not articulate a reason why the aff perpetuates cap because of the DA then it is not offense.

#### 1] Case outweighs ---

#### 2] Status quo solves and nuclear desalination is ineffective. SMITH 11:

Gar Smith 11, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War, "NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE," June, International Forum on Globalization series focused on False Solutions, <http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear_Roulette_book.pdf>

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. Nuclear proponents groping for justifications to expand nuclear power have argued that the waste heat from power plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing salt from seawater. Desalination plants (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable water a day. 153 The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today.¶ But nuclear desalination is another False Solution. The problem with atomic water-purifiers is that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20 th -century technology. Thermal desalination has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper to operate. 154 Nuclear desalination advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power aren’t up to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce high purity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit. 155 Promoting reactors as a solution to the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more water than any other energy source. 156¶ Even proponents admit there is a potential risk that running seawater through a radioactive environment might contaminate the drinking water produced. 157 Undeterred, scientists in Russia and India have proposed anchoring small atom-powered water-plants offshore near densely populated coastal cities. But this would provide no relief for the billions of people living inland in water-starved regions of North Africa and Asia.¶ Desalination is merely a way of giving a marginal new purpose to existing reactors whose balance sheets would be improved if they were retrofitted with desalination chambers. As with power generation, so with desalination: efficiency in water use (better irrigation technology, crop selection, eliminating transit losses, etc.) beats new production.¶ A real solution to the growing global water shortage needs to address the increasing amount of water diverted to wasteful agricultural and industrial practices and concentrate on preventing the water from being contaminated in the first place—by, among other things, capping the size of local populations to match locally available water supplies.

#### 3] Nuclear power consumes way more water than you thought --- DA causes more water wars. WAREHAM AND GREEN:

"Nuclear power and water scarcity," ScienceAlert, <http://www.sciencealert.com/nuclear-power-and-water-scarcity> Dr Sue Wareham became involved in MAPW over 20 years ago out of a "horror at the destructive capacity of a single nuclear weapon." Sue believes that her work through MAPW is fundamental to her commitment to the protection of human life and the improvement of human well-being. Dr Jim Green is the national nuclear campaigner for Friends of the Earth and author of the report No Solution To Climate Change (pdf file 1.98MB) launched in September 2005. His PhD thesis dealt with the history of the Lucas Heights nuclear plant and the debate over the replacement of its nuclear research reactor. He is a member of the EnergyScience Coalition. Read his essay Environmentalists Do Not Support Nuclear Power: Critique of James Lovelock and Patrick Moore.

The connections between water scarcity, power generation and the federal government's promotion of nuclear power are worth reflecting on in National Water Week, held from October 21-27. Some problems associated with nuclear power are much discussed – such as its connection to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Less well known is the fact that nuclear power is the most water-hungry of all energy sources, with a single reactor consuming 35-65 million litres of water each day. Water scarcity is already a serious problem for Australia's power-generation industry, largely because of our heavy reliance on water-guzzling coal-fired plants. Current problems in Australia's power industry resulting from water shortages include: expensive long-distance water haulage to some power plants as local supplies dwindle; reduced electrical generating capacity and output at some coal and hydro plants; higher and more volatile electricity prices; increased risks of blackouts; and intensified competition for water between power plants, agriculture, industries, and environmental flows. Introducing nuclear power would exacerbate those problems. A December 2006 report by the Commonwealth Department of Parliamentary Services notes that the water requirements for a nuclear power station are 20-83 per cent higher than for other power stations. Moreover, those calculations do not include water consumption by uranium mines. The Roxby Downs mine in South Australia uses 35 million litres of water each day, with plans to increase this to 150 million litres each day. Mine operator BHP Billiton does not pay one cent for this water despite recording a record $17 billion profit in 2006-07. Water outflows from nuclear power plants can damage the local environment. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency states: "When nuclear power plants remove water from a lake or river for steam production and cooling, fish and other aquatic life can be affected. Water pollutants, such as heavy metals and salts, build up in the water used in the nuclear power plant systems. These water pollutants, as well as the higher temperature of the water discharged from the power plant, can negatively affect water quality and aquatic life." A report by the U.S. Nuclear Information and Resource Service details the destruction of delicate marine ecosystems and large numbers of animals, including endangered species, by nuclear power plants. Most of the damage is done by water inflow pipes, while expulsion of warm water causes further damage. Another documented problem is 'cold stunning' - fish acclimatise to warm water but die when the reactor is taken off-line and warm water is no longer expelled. In New Jersey, local fishermen estimated that 4,000 fish died from cold stunning when a reactor was shut down. Nuclear reactors in numerous European countries have been periodically taken off-line or operated at reduced output in recent years because of water shortages driven by climate change, drought and heat waves. Nuclear utilities have also sought and secured exemptions from operating conditions in order to discharge overheated water. The water consumption of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency and conservation measures is negligible compared to nuclear or coal. Operating a 2,400 Watt fan heater for one hour consumes 0.01 litres of water if wind is the energy source, 0.26 litres if solar is the energy source, 4.5 litres if coal is the energy source, or 5.5 litres if nuclear power is the energy source. Tim Flannery, the 2007 Australian of the Year, notes that hastening the uptake of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and geothermal 'hot rocks' will help ease the water crisis as well as reducing greenhouse gas emissions - a win-win outcome. Globally, there is another compelling reason to ensure that decisions on water allocation - including its use in energy production - are made wisely and equitably. Limited access to water is already contributing to armed conflicts ('water wars') in a number of places around the globe. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon recently noted that shortages of food and water in sub-Saharan Africa were a precursor to the current tragic violence in Darfur. The problem goes "far beyond Darfur", he warned, as many other places are now suffering water shortages. Australia can ill-afford to replace one thirsty industry, coal, with an even thirstier one, nuclear power.

#### 4] The global desalination market is set to grow by 320% – extensive market data proves the plan isn’t key. SBI ENERGY 11:

[SBI Energy, a division of MarketResearch.com, publishes research reports in the industrial, energy, building/construction, and automotive/transportation markets, “Global Desalination Market will Grow 320.3% by 2020, Driven by Reverse Osmosis,” August 23]

Depleting water supplies, coupled with increasing water demand, are driving the global market for desalination technology, which is expected to reach $52.4 billion by 2020, up 320.3% from $12.5 billion in 2010. According to a recent report from energy research publisher SBI Energy, membrane technology reverse osmosis will see the largest growth, reaching $39.46 billion by 2020. The increasing world population, which is estimated to reach 7.52 billion by 2020, up from 6.85 billion in 2010, is depleting a limited fresh water supply with agricultural demands and urbanization leading to more water consumption per person across the globe. According to the report, industrialization is spreading advanced water extraction technology, which is quickly diminishing water resources. "Economic and population growth are the largest drivers for desalination technology," said Shelly Carr, publisher of SBI Energy. "The explosive growth of this market is due to a solution-based alternative to the diminishing supply of the world's most important resource." Desalination technology involves extracting salt and other unwanted minerals from saltwater or brackish water in order to produce fresh water. There are two types of technologies: thermal which relies on heat, and membrane which utilizes semi-permeable membranes to separate salt from seawater and brackish water. According to the report, the cost of desalination is highly influenced by the amount of energy consumed, causing energy efficient membrane technologies, specifically reverse osmosis, to be the most viable option. "**T**he lower operating costs of membrane technologies, which include reverse osmosis, microfiltration, ultrafiltration and nanofiltration, make them a more attractive option," notes Carr. "This segment will grow significantly more than its thermal counterpart." **SBI Energy's report**, World Desalination Components and Technologies, provides segmented market data for desalination technologies, exhibiting where the growth will occur through 2020. It profiles fifteen major companies, examines major projects and positions of specific countries, and analyzes trends and growth drivers. It is available at: <http://www.sbireports.com/redirect.asp?progid=82216&productid=6281776>.

#### 5] No water wars – other tensions overwhelm. VICTOR 07:

[David G., professor of law at Stanford University, November/December. “What resource wars?” National Interest. Ebsco]

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict ranks extremely low on the list because it is highly unlikely to materialize. **Despite decades of warnings about water wars**, what is striking is that **water wars don't happen**--usually **because** **countries that share water** resources **have** a lot **more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem.** **Some analysts have pointed to conflicts** over resources, including **water** and valuable land, **as a cause in the Rwandan** **genocide**, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. **But** none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny--**the conflicts over resources** **are** usually **symptomatic of** deeper **failures in** **governance and other** primal **forces** for conflicts, **such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and** other **unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension**. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker "climate" conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.

### Elections:

#### 1] Disad non-unique --- Hilary doesn’t oppose nuclear power. CONCA 16:

[Conca, James. “Will A President Hillary Clinton Close Down Nuclear Power Plants?” August 16, 2016 // LHP AA]

**No**. In fact, **Clinton** generally [**supports nuclear energy**](http://www.nei.org/News-Media/Media-Room/News-Releases/Clinton-Energy-Proposal-Nuclear-Renewables-Essenti). She does not want any nuclear power plants to close prematurely, particularly the New York Indian Point nuclear plant. **Clinton says** that “**rapidly shutting down** **our nation’s nuclear power fleet puts ideology ahead of science** **and** **would make it harder** and costlier **to build a clean** energy **future**”, agreeing with EPA chief Gina McCarthy, leading climate scientist Dr. James Hansen and almost all nuclear scientists.¶ Clinton opposes the Yucca Mountain nuclear repository and supports the President’s [Blue Ribbon Commission](http://www.energy.gov/ne/downloads/blue-ribbon-commission-americas-nuclear-future-report-secretary-energy) recommendations for [our nuclear future](http://www.wmsym.org/archives/2012/papers/12469.pdf).¶ **She is the most reasoned** **candidate on energy we’ve ever had running for President**.¶ **The Clinton campaign laid out a policy** **goal** **of achieving 33% of U.S. electricity from non-carbon-emitting sources** by 2027, **including** **maintaining our nuclear energy fleet**.¶

#### 2] People hate nuke power now – disad wont affect voters enough to flip the election. GALLUP 16:

[Gallup Poll. “For First Time, Majority in U.S. Oppose Nuclear Energy” March 2016 // LHP AA]

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- For the first time since Gallup first asked the question in 1994**, a majority of Americans say they oppose nuclear energy. The 54% opposing it is up** significantly **from** **43% a year ago**, while the 44% who favor using nuclear energy is down from 51%.

#### 3] Nuclear bans popular, and pro-nuclear doesn’t matter to voters. CASEY 8-5:

Renewable Energy Wars: Living Microbial Electricity Generators Vs. The Nukes August 5th, 2016 by Tina Casey https://cleantechnica.com/2016/08/05/renewable-energy-wars-bacteria-power-vs-nuclear-power/

Michigan State University is poised to enter the exciting field of microbial waste management with an electrifying renewable energy twist. Researchers at the school have demonstrated that they can grow layers of electricity producing bacteria on films, deploying a scalable process that’s this close to achieving commercial viability. So, in a world where you can grow your own power plant consisting of gelatinous films of bacteria that can generate electricity from waste, is there still a place for nuclear energy**?** renewable energy bacteria Bacterial Electricity Vs. Nuclear Electricity The short answer is probably, though perhaps not for long, at least in some countries. Here in the US, for example, nuclear energy has hit a brick wall. Despite its attraction as a zero emission energy producer, nuclear power plants are rapidly proving themselves to be high cost, high risk dinosaurs in a future populated by low risk, low cost renewable resources like wind and solar. Two other factors working against the growth of nuclear energy in the US are the emergence of utility scale energy storage for wind and solar, along with the development of “virtual” power plants. In another demonstration of the pushback against nuclear energy, New York State’s recent, controversial decision to ramp up subsidies for its existing nuclear plants is already facing legal challenges. The prospects for new nuclear power plants in the US are further dimmed by the capability of local communities to oppose them, and the reluctance of elected representatives to rile up their electorates.

#### [Harvard Westlake] People hate nuke power now. Your 43% opposition flipped to 54% --- specifically indicts your Riffkin ev - postdates. GALLUP 16:

[Gallup Poll. “For First Time, Majority in U.S. Oppose Nuclear Energy” March 2016 // LHP AA]

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- For the first time since Gallup first asked the question in 1994**, a majority of Americans say they oppose nuclear energy. The 54% opposing it is up** significantly **from** **43% a year ago**, while the 44% who favor using nuclear energy is down from 51%.

## Counterplan:

### Thorium:

#### 1] The counterplan both doesn’t solve and is a new link to the aff --- its just a tool to pump out money and fuel the industry even though it will never get buidt . REES 11:

[Rees, Eifion. “Don't believe the spin on thorium being a greener nuclear option” June 23 2011 // LHP AA]

**There is a** significant **sticking point to the promotion of thorium as the 'great green hope'** of clean energy production: **it remains** unproven on a commercial scale. While **it has been** **around since the 1950s** (and an experimental 10MW LFTR did run for five years during the 1960s at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in the US, though using uranium and plutonium as fuel) **it** **is still a next generation nuclear technology** – theoretical. China did announce this year that it intended to develop a thorium MSR, but nuclear radiologist Peter Karamoskos, of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), says the world shouldn't hold its breath. 'Without exception, [**thorium reactors] have never been commercially viable, nor do any of the** intended **new designs** **even** remotely **seem to be viable**. **Like** **all nuclear power production** **they** **rely on extensive** taxpayer **subsidies**; the only difference is that with **thorium** and other breeder reactors these **are of an order of magnitude greater**, **which is why no government has ever continued their funding.**' China's development will persist until it experiences the ongoing major technical hurdles the rest of the nuclear club have discovered, he says. Others see thorium as a smokescreen to perpetuate the status quo: the world's only operating thorium reactor – India's Kakrapar-1 – is actually a converted PWR, for example. 'This could be seen to excuse the continued use of PWRs until thorium is [widely] available,' points out Peter Rowberry of No Money for Nuclear (NM4N) and Communities Against Nuclear Expansion (CANE). In his reading, **thorium is** merely **a way of deflecting** **attention** and criticism **from the dangers of the uranium fuel cycle and excusing the** **pumping of more money into the industry.**

#### 2] Doesn’t solve the aff --- the aff is a critique of the state that comes with nuclear power --- this means any reactors left over still keep the industry running, which is bad.

#### 3] Plants take 7 years to build – case is comparatively better on timeframe. NEA:

Nuclear Energy Agency Press Room https://www.oecd-nea.org/news/press-kits/economics-FAQ.html

As nuclear power plants are complex construction projects, their construction periods are longer than other large power plants. It is typically expected to take 5 to 7 years to build a large nuclear unit (not including the time required for planning and licensing). Currently in countries such as South Korea and China, typical construction times range from 4 to 6 years, and in European countries construction may take between 6 and 8 years. In comparison, large coal plants can be built in about 4 years, while the construction time for natural gas fired plants is around 3 years.

## NC:

### Libertarianism

#### 1] Cap DA --- the NC says we should have minimal government intervention and let them